Remarks

In the previous Office Action of May 19, 2003, Claims 23-38 were rejected.

Claims 31, 32, and 35-37 are presently pending. Claims 23-30, 33, 34, and 38 are cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1-22 were previously cancelled without prejudice. Claims 31, 32, 35, and 36 have been amended.

Applicants respectfully request continued examination of the foregoing application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

CLAIMS 31, 32, AND 35-37 ARE ALLOWABLE

Claim 31 has been amended to include "a multiplexer for selecting a particular one of the one or more signals based on a Gray Code." Applicants respectfully submit that at least the foregoing is not taught or fairly suggested by Ghoshal, Kozu, or Barrett, either alone, or in combination,

In the Examination of Claim 34 (now cancelled) Examiner indicated that:

"[t]he combination of Kozu and Ghoshal's references shows all limitations of the claim except for 'the multiplexer selects the particular phase based on a Gray code.' However, Barrett, et. al. shows in Figure 3 a Gray code MUX with the advantage of providing faster control path than other types of decode devices. Therefore, it would have been

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to employ the teaching of Barrett, et. al., in to Ghoshal's MUX for the purpose of having [a] faster control path."

Office Action, 5/19/03, at p. 6. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Barrett is Mischaracterized

Barrett does not disclose "a multiplexer for selecting a particular one of the one or more signals based on a Gray Code" or a "Gray Code MUX". The Barrett discloses "Tree-Type Multiplexers and Methods for Configuring the Same." Barrett, Cover Page, Title. Barrett makes no reference to a Gray Code whatsoever.

Examiner has characterized Barrett, Figure 3 as a "Gray Code MUX." Applicants respectfully submit that Figure 3 is not characterized by Barrett as such. Furthermore, no reasoning or authority has been provided to support the conclusion that Figure 3 is a "Gray Code MUX", or that the structure described in Figure 3 makes a selection "based upon a Gray Code".

Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 31, and dependent claims 32, 35, 36, and 37.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, each of the pending claims 31, 32, 35, 36, and 37 are allowable. Therefore, the application is in a condition for allowance and a notice of allowance is hereby requested.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED

Mirut Dalal - Reg. No. 44,052

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

McAndrews, Held & Malloy 500 W. Madison - Suite 3400 Chicago, IL 60661

Phone (312) 775-8063 FAX (312) 775-8100